1	ADAM PAUL LAXALT		
2	Attorney General Frank A. Toddre II (Bar No. 11474) Deputy Attorney General State of Nevada Office of the Attorney General 555 E. Washington Avenue, Suite 3900 Las Vegas, NV 89101 (702) 486, 2140 (shore)		
3			
4			
5			
	(702) 486-3149 (phone) (702) 486-3773 (fax)		
6	ftoddre@ag.nv.gov		
7	Attorneys for Defendants Romeo Aranas, Bruce Bannister, James Cox, Sheryl Foster,		
8	Ira Hollingsworth, Roy Hookham, Nevada Board of State Prison Commissioners, Nevada Department of Corrections, Dwight Neven, and Brian Williams		
9			
10	Byight reven, and Brian williams		
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
12	DISTRICT OF NEVADA		
13	DONALD MOON,	CASE NO. 2:14-cv-02140-APG-GWF	
14	Plaintiff,	STIPULATION AND ORDER TO	
15	vs.	EXTEND SCHEDULING ORDER AND REQUEST MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
16	James Cox, et al.,	SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE	
17	Defendants.	Consolidated with Case No. 2:16-cv-02082-APG-PAL	
18			
19	DONALD J. BOGOTAITIS,		
20	Plaintiff,		
21	vs.		
22	STATE OF NEVADA, ex rel, the BOARD		
	OF COMMISSIONERS, et al.,		
23	Defendants.		
24			
25	The parties, via counsel, hereby request this Court schedule a settlement conference		

The parties, via counsel, hereby request this Court schedule a settlement conference for the parties in this case on one of the dates indicated below. The reason both counsel make this request is that they believe the case is presently in the posture for constructive settlement negotiations and they wish to avoid the impending motion practice that will

26

27

28

 $\frac{1}{2}$

3 4

5 6 7

8 9

11

10

12 13

14 15

16

17

18

19

 $\frac{21}{22}$

20

23

2425

26

27

28

///

///

ensue relating to injunctive relief and dispositive issues. The request is made in earnest and in good faith as the parties have had significant settlement discussion.

Pursuant to LR 6-1 and LR 26-4, the parties, by and through their respective counsel of record, in lieu of the requested settlement conference hereby jointly request that this Honorable Court extend the deadline for scheduling order accordingly and continue the discovery period for forty-five (45) days after the requested settlement conference, and that the dispositive motion be continued to seventy-five (75) days after the same.

Counsel notes that the two above cases were consolidated on December 12, 2016 as they both involved common questions of law and fact. The Settlement Conference will encompass both matters.

I. PROCEDURAL POSTURE

A. Discovery Completed pursuant to Local Rule 26-4

Discovery is set to conclude on August 5, 2017. Based upon constructive settlement discussions with NDOC Deputy Director David Tristan, the parties had agreed to delay written discovery in an effort to reduce litigation fees as the parties discussed settlement values and relevant 'time credit' matters relevant to both Plaintiffs.

B. Reasons that Dispositive Motions Cannot be Completed within the Date Set by Scheduling Order

The parties have concentrated their efforts over the last months on the material revision of the subject housing policy that Moon and Bogotaitis have alleged as unconstitutional. The parties have long agreed that a meaningful settlement conference, rather dispositive motions will provide a mutually agreeable resolution. Due to the nature of these talks and the length of time it has taken to undertake Administrative Regulation revisions, the parties had agreed not to pursue discovery or motion practice in an effort to spare fees and costs associated with drafting dispositive motions.

 $\frac{4}{5}$

7 8

6

9

11

12

10

1314

15 16

17

18 19

20

22

23

21

2425

2627

28

The parties agree that extending the discovery and motion deadline to forty-five and seventy-five days after the Settlement Conference will provide sufficient time to draft dispositive motions in the event that a settlement is not reached. Further an extension of this length will not significantly delay the litigation of this matter.

C. Remaining Discovery

The parties do not contemplate additional discovery at this junction. However, the parties will provide an outline to the Court of proposed discovery if the matters do not reach a resolution.

D. Proposed Schedule

• Discovery Deadline

Forty Five days after Settlement Conference

Dispositive Motion Deadline
 Seventy-Five days after Conference

For purposes of this Motion and anticipated scheduling order, the parties have a mutual understanding and agreement that the term "dispositive motions" shall include motions for summary judgment or adjudication of the issues, as well as motions for preliminary injunction or similarly plead motions requesting equitable relief.

II. GOOD CAUSE EXISTS TO EXTEND PENDING DEADLINES

The parties have demonstrated good faith in conducting all discovery and in stipulating to agree to a Settlement Conference. In requesting this joint motion, the parties have followed the required meet and confer rules required to obtain compliance and to determine scheduling dates without contentious motion practice.

III. SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE

A. PARTY AVAILABILITY AND LOGISTICAL CONCERNS

Mr. Moon and Mr. Bogotaitis are no longer in the custody of the NDOC and anticipate attending a Settlement Conference in person, with counsel.

Defendants Bruce Bannister, James Cox, and Sheryl Foster are all retired and no longer reside in Las Vegas. The parties would request that they be excused as they do not have current knowledge as to the revised Housing policy, their presence is not necessary for successful negotiations and the cost to fly these persons to Las Vegas is inversely

proportional to their actual knowledge and participation in the case. Alternatively, the parties request that the out of town Defendants be permitted to participate telephonically.

Additionally, Plaintiff Bogotaitis has served the Nevada Board of Prison Commissioners as an entity and each State officer in their official capacity. The State of Nevada respectfully seeks to have one individual from the Nevada Department of Corrections to attend with authority on their behalf as to this matter. Defense Counsel maintains that this approach will allow for the best potential resolution of pending issues and facilitate good faith negotiations.

В. AVAILABLE DATES FOR SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE

The parties, recognizing that inmate mediation conferences are usually entertained by this Court on Fridays, submit the following viable dates for settlement Conference:

- September 1, 2017;
- October 6, 2017;
- October 20, 2017;
- October 27, 2017.

///

///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1	IV. CONCLUSION	
2	Based upon the foregoing reason	ons, the parties request that this Court grant the
3	requested relief and continue deadlines as requested herein.	
4	RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,	
5	DATED: June 13, 2017.	DATED: June 13, 2017.
6		
7	GALLIAN WELKER & BECKSTROM, L.C.	ADAM PAUL LAXALT Nevada Attorney General
8	,	
9		
10	By: /s/ Travis Barrick Travis Barrick, Esq.	By: /s/ Frank A. Toddre II Frank A. Toddre II (NV Bar No. 11474)
11	Nevada Bar No. 9257 540 E. St. Louis Avenue	Deputy Attorney General Office of the Nevada Attorney General
12	Las Vegas, Nevada 89104 Attorney for Plaintiffs	555 E. Washington Avenue, Suite 3900 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
13	In conjunction with the Pro Bono Program and the Legal Aid Center Of Southern Nevada	Attorneys for Defendants
14		Sheryl Foster, Romeo Aranas, Bruce Bannister, James Cox, Ira Hollingsworth,
15		Roy Hookham, Dwight Neven, Brian Williams, Nevada Board of State Prison
16		Commissioners, Nevada Department of Corrections
17		
18	ORDER:	
19	GOOD CAUSE APPEARING, The parties and their counsel shall appear and be prepared	
20	to participate in a settlement conference before this court onor before September 30, 2017	
21	The Discovery deadline is accordingly set at: October 16, 2017	
22	The Dispositive motion deadline is set	at:November 15. 2017
23		$\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{D}$
24		MAGISTRATE JUDGE
25		UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA
26		DISTRICT OF NEVADA Dated: 6/23/2017
27		26.00.0,20,2011
28		